

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication in a law journal and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 18

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAILED

JUL 19 2002

PAT. & T.M. OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte FRANK J. PELLEGRINO  
and  
ROBERT W. FLETCHER

---

Appeal No. 2001-0957  
Application No. 08/581,992

---

ORDER REMANDING TO EXAMINER

---

On December 23, 1999, appellants filed an Appeal Brief (Paper No. 16). On March 14, 2000, the examiner entered an Examiner's Answer (Paper No. 17). The examiner states on page 4 of the Answer, first paragraph, that "[c]laims 1-19 remain rejected under 35 USC § 101 non-statutory matter. This rejection is set forth in prior office actions, Paper Nos. 2, 5, and 9." According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1208(A) (7th ed., July 1998):

Examiners may incorporate in the answer their statement of the grounds of rejection merely by reference to the final rejection (or a single other action on which it is based, MPEP § 706.07). Only those statements of grounds of rejection appearing in a

Appeal No. 2001-0957  
Application No. 08/581,992

*single* prior action may be incorporated by reference.  
An examiner's answer should not refer, either directly  
or indirectly, to more than one prior Office action.

A review of the application reveals that the examiner refers to more than one single Office action when stating the grounds of rejection, namely, at least three Office actions. Therefore, the Examiner's Answer does not comply with the requirements set forth in MPEP § 1208(A).

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the examiner in order to place the Examiner's Answer in compliance with the MPEP, or for such further action as may be appropriate.

It is important that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences be informed promptly of any action affecting the status of the appeal (i.e., abandonment, issue, reopening prosecution).

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

By: 

KIMBERLY JORDAN  
Program and Resource Administrator  
(703) 308-9797

KJ:clm

Appeal No. 2001-0957  
Application No. 08/581,992

Robert W. Fletcher  
10503 Timberwood Circle  
Suite 220  
Louisville, KY 40223

July 26, 2002

Kimberly Jordan

It appears that in this case, although the opening paragraph in the Grounds for Rejection refers to "Paper Nos. 2,5 and 9" it goes on to state that the "rejection in the final action is as follows." It then repeats verbatim the rejection as stated in the Final rejection which was Paper No. 9. The complete rejection is in the Answer. The other papers 2 and 5, had the identical rejection and language.

Although it may appear to refer back to more than a single preceding action, in fact the statement of the grounds for rejection is complete in the Examiner's Answer and this is evident when reading the whole record.

As we discussed on the phone Thursday and Friday July 25 and 26, I am sending this back to you to see if you can clarify this matter in the record.

Thanks for your help.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Mitchell", with a stylized, cursive script.

Dave Mitchell  
QAS, TC 3600  
703 308-0361